

NR_key_name: 60C756B600B370BC852562340067AE89
SendTo: CN=Chet Rhodes/O=ARRB @ ARRB
CopyTo: CN=Phil Golrick/O=ARRB @ ARRB
DisplayBlindCopyTo:
BlindCopyTo: CN=R ecord/O=ARRB
From: CN=Jeremy Gunn/O=ARRB
DisplayFromDomain:
DisplayDate: 09/11/1995
DisplayDate_Time: 2:53:06 PM
ComposedDate: 09/11/1995
ComposedDate_Time: 2:52:29 PM
Subject: Re: review track database

Body: Chet--Please try to take care of this.
recstat: Record
DeliveryPriority: N
DeliveryReport: B
ReturnReceipt:
Categories:

To: Chet Rhodes/ARRBcc: Jeremy Gunn/ARRB, David Marwell/ARRB, Kevin Tiernan/ARRB From: Phil Golrick/ARRB Date: 09/11/95 02:43:55 PM Subject: Review track database
I think we've talked about this before . . . The Review Track database needs more flexibility in pairing (or tripling, etc.) together multiple grounds for a single redaction. As it is now, for example, a redaction taken on both confidential informant (Section 6(4)) and personal privacy (Section 6(3)) grounds must be analyzed as separate postponements. This results in double-counting in the number of "ARRB Releases" or "Sustained Postponements" stated in the automatically-generated draft notice for the Federal Register. As we move toward high-volume postponement review, it will be increasingly burdensome to identify and correct such discrepancies before sending the notice to the Federal Register for publication.